

E2
cont.

78. (New) The device of claim 77, wherein the position signal is operative to scroll a document displayed on the graphical interface, a speed at which the document is scrolled being proportional to a magnitude of the first haptic feedback.

79. (New) The device of claim 77, wherein the position signal is operative to scroll a document displayed on the graphical interface, a speed at which the document is scrolled being proportional to a magnitude of the second haptic feedback.--

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 39, 40, 42-44, 49, 50, 52-54 and 61-79 are pending in the application, with claims 42, 52, 63, 66, 67, 72 and 76 being the independent claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 39, 40, 42-44, 49, 50, 52-54, 61, 62, 64 and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Examiner suggests that the phrase "wherein said force feedback sensation is a resistive spring force resisting motion of said cursor into said icon" and that the type of force that resists motion of the cursor into an icon was not described in the specification. Applicants submit that the claimed "wherein said force feedback sensation is a resistive spring force resisting motion of said cursor into said icon" is supported by the specification by at least the following portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,166,723, the disclosure of which is incorporated by reference in the present application.

“The user experiences the forces generated on the mouse 12 as realistic simulations of force sensations such as jolts, springs, textures, “barrier” forces, and the like.” Col. 5, lines 64-67.

“However, when the force mode is active (such as by pressing or holding button 15a), a spring force will be output on mouse 12 opposing the movement of the cursor through the window border. This force is used as for “pressure scrolling” or as a “scroll surface”, where the amount of penetration of the mouse against the spring force controls the speed of scrolling of a document displayed in that window.” Col. 10, lines 32-39.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner’s indication of allowable subject matter in the present application.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that further personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COOLEY GODWARD LLP

Date: December 9, 2002

By:



Erik B. Milch
Reg. No. 42,887

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston Town Center
Reston, Virginia 20190-5656
(703) 456-8000 – Phone
(703) 456-8100 - Facsimile

Enclosure: Appendix indicating claim amendments

Claim Amendments

54. (Amended) A method as recited in claim 52 wherein said spring force enables an isometric control mode, wherein an amount of penetration of the [mouse]manipulandum against the spring force controls a speed of scrolling of a document displayed by said host computer.

154998 v1/RE
3BL\$01!.DOC